HOW CAN WE SHARE THE WEALTH?

THE COMMUNIST WAY VERSUS HUEY LONG

By ALEX BITTELMAN

3c

Read About Communism and What Communists Stand For

●

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—The Burning Issue of the Day—*By Earl Browder* ..... .03

THE REAL HUEY P. LONG—*By Sender Garlin* .05

THE TRUTH ABOUT FATHER COUGHLIN—*By A. B. Magil* ..... .05

WHY HEARST LIES ABOUT COMMUNISM *By William F. Dunne* ..... .05

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE SOVIET UNION—*By V. M. Molotov* ..... .03

WHY FASCISM LEADS TO WAR-*By John Strachey* .05

NATIONAL DEFENSE FOR WHOM?—*By Harold Ward* ..... .05

THE HISTORY OF MAY DAY—*By Alexander Trachtenberg* ..... .03

THE SOVIET UNION—YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED—*By Margaret Cowl* ..... .03

MARXISM VERSUS LIBERALISM—The Interview Between *Joseph Stalin* and *H. G. Wells* ..... .02

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO—*By Karl Marx* and *Frederick Engels* ..... .05

THE PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL ..... .10

STATE AND REVOLUTION—*By V. I. Lenin* .... .10

WHY COMMUNISM—Plain Talks on Vital Problems *By M. J. Olgin* ..... .05

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City

HOW CAN WE SHARE THE WEALTH?

By ALEX BITTELMAN

The Long-Coughlin-Johnson "Controversy"

IN the early part of March, 1935, the political temperature of this country registered a sudden rise. A heated "controversy" broke out among three prominent people. On one side of this peculiar debate stood General Hugh Johnson of Wall Street, who is described by his opponents as "a chocolate soldier"; and on the other stood "share-the-wealth Long" and "social-justice Coughlin" who are described by Johnson as the "two pied pipers".

A great controversy!

What was this controversy all about? According to General Johnson of Wall Street, the "two pied pipers" are supposed to be dangerous revolutionists; and, believe it or not, the radio priest, Coughlin, would appear to be the head of a "national revolutionary party". This is nothing less than sensational. True, Johnson also suggested that these two "dangerous revolutionists" were in some way supported and encouraged by certain reactionary circles in the Republican Party. And, if this is so, the whole Johnsonian argument fails to make sense. Because, who has ever heard of the Republican Party, not only the reactionaries but also the progressives, encouraging and supporting revolutionists? They don't support or encourage the Communist Party, do they? But we will let that stand for the moment.

Now, if we turn to the "two pied pipers", the controversy would seem to have been caused by the bankruptcy of the N.R.A. According to Long, it was he who was chosen by Roosevelt as the scapegoat to cover up the dismal failure of the N.R.A. It transpires, if we take Long's word for it, that it was he who tried to hold Roosevelt down to his promises to redistribute the wealth of the country; it was he who had warned Roosevelt that the N.R.A. would be a failure if these promises were not fulfilled. And, now that these forewarnings have come true, Roosevelt is trying to avenge himself upon the fellow who has made them.

So, if we believe Long, it all comes down to his scheme for

the redistribution of wealth, to his plan of "share-the-wealth". It is our intention, in this series of articles, to examine this plan objectively and thoroughly. Any plan for the abolition of poverty, which claims to have discovered a way of achieving this objective of the Communist Party without resort to the working-class revolution and socialism, is a challenge to us—a challenge which we must seriously examine and answer.

Huey Long claims to have discovered such a way. He claims to have gotten hold of a plan "for guaranteeing comfort and convenience to all humanity out of this abundance in our country" (*New York Times*, March 8, 1935), without the need of fighting for it, without overthrowing the political power of the capitalists and establishing the political power of the workers and toiling farmers, without expropriating the means of production owned now by the monopolies, and without building a socialist economy as the first phase of Communism.

In other words, *Long promises to accomplish the chief objective of the Communist Party—the abolition of poverty and a decent living for all toilers—without adopting the Communist road to this objective.* More than that, he promises to accomplish this Communist objective by means of struggle *against* the Communist Party. That is strange, isn't it? And it is also a bit reminiscent of Hitler's promises in Germany. But we will not press this point now. At present we wish only to establish beyond controversy Long's true position with respect to socialization of industry and Communism.

On the first question, he is reported to have said that:

> ". . . he did not plan the complete socialization of industry. Even in the case where he would have the government confiscate virtually two-thirds of a person's holdings in his own business, he would leave all the voting stock in the hands of the industrialist." (*New York Times*, March 9, 1935.)

And on the question of Communism, he said:

> "Communism? Communism? Hell, no. This plan is the only defense this country's got against communism and it's got to be put in force within the next five years or communism will be upon us." (*Ibid.*)

What Price Promises?

One need not necessarily be a Communist in order to have

one's suspicions aroused by any fellow who sets out to accomplish the main aim of Communism by declaring war against the party of Communism. Such a fellow needs to be investigated by comparing his words with his deeds, his promises with his accomplishments. Because—what price promises? We have had them aplenty; and we all know the results. Didn't Hoover promise us a "chicken in every pot" and "an automobile in every garage"? And what happened to it? On this question we can call upon Wall Street Johnson—the Democrat—to give objective evidence, since the above promise was made by a Republican President. And Johnson says: the promise of Hoover "turned out to be two chickens in every garage". (*New York Times*, March 5, 1935.)

Why should we believe Long more than Hoover?

Roosevelt, too, has made some tall promises: especially Roosevelt, we should say. And what happened to that? Let Huey Long tell the story.

> "So we convinced Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt that it was necessary that he announce and promise to the American people that in the event he were elected President of the United States he would pull down the size of the big man's fortune and guarantee something to every family, *enough to do away with all poverty*, and to give employment to those who were able to work and an education to the children born into the world." (*New York Times*, March 8, 1935.)

So we have it on the authority of Long himself that Roosevelt was convinced by "we", meaning Long and his friends, to promise the American people "to do away with all poverty". *Long, on his own admission, was a partner to the scheme.* Then what happened? Says Long:

> "Mr. Roosevelt made those promises. He made them before he was nominated in the Chicago convention, he made them again before he was elected in November, and he went so far as to remake those promises a day or two after he was inaugurated President of the United States, *and I was one authorized to say so*, and I thought *for a day or two* after he took the oath as President that *maybe* he was going through with his promises." (*Ibid.*)

Again we have it on Long's own admission that (1) he was very uncertain of Roosevelt's sincerity; that (2) he only thought that "maybe" Roosevelt will go through with his promises; and that (3) he thought so only "for a day or two". Clearly, Long

had all the reasons in the world to come out before the elections and make it clear to the people that, as far as these promises were concerned, Roosevelt could not be depended upon. But no, Long did the exact opposite: he accepted Roosevelt's authorization to assure the American people that Roosevelt was OK.

Then what happened? Says Long:

> "But no heart has ever been so saddened, no person's ambition was ever so blighted as was mine when I came to the realization *that the President of the United States was not going to undertake what he said he would do.*" (*Ibid.*)

We have no means of entering Mr. Long's heart to see how much "saddened" it was at the realization that Roosevelt was breaking his promises. But what we can do is to draw certain provisional conclusions regarding the value of promises of this type. Mr. Roosevelt, together with Mr. Long, have promised to do away with poverty. This promise was shamelessly violated by Roosevelt, so says Long; and he is right on that. *But where is the assurance that Long would not do the same?*

Just think of this:

Long is the boss of Louisiana. He himself boasts of having in his vest pocket the government of that state. Surely, he couldn't have more power in the whole United States, if he were President, than he has now in Louisiana. And what has he done with that power to alleviate the suffering of the masses in his state?

How many homes has he given to the toiling farmers, the workers, and the Negroes in Louisiana? How many children of these toilers has Long placed in colleges? To how many unemployed workers and starving farmers has he made available decent and sufficient relief? Has he adopted any effective laws for unemployment and social insurance? Has he adopted any laws to shorten the workday and to enforce a minimum of wages of $2,500 a year? What has he done to secure the democratic rights of the toiling masses? What has he done to do away with the semi-slave share-cropping system? What has he done to do away with the iniquities of Negro inequality in his state?

We say what has he done. But we might as well ask: *what has he tried to do* along the lines of his promises and "share-the-wealth" plan?

The answer is: *Nothing.*

Why, then, should anybody suppose that Long's promises for the whole United States are worth more than Roosevelt's or Hoover's? When and where has Long proved that he is more sincere than these two gentlemen? At no time and nowhere. Least of all in his own state where he enjoys full power. On the contrary, by his own admission, he is responsible for the election of Roosevelt and for the ballyhoo about the New Deal being an attempt to abolish poverty in the United States.

Long has done nothing to make the American people feel confident in him. He has done, and is doing, everything to make the toiling masses extremely distrustful of everything he says and does.

Promises of such people as Long must be scrutinized very closely and with more than a grain of suspicion. Accordingly, we shall turn to an examination of Long's "share-the-wealth" plan.

Cutting Down Fortunes Instead of Abolishing Capitalist Exploitation

This, then, is Huey Long's position.

He declares war against Communism because the Communist Party proposes to abolish capitalist exploitation which is the source of all big fortunes on the one hand, and of all the poverty, on the other. Long proposes to leave the system of capitalist exploitation intact but he promises that "every big fortune will be cut down immediately". (*New York Times,* March 8, 1935.) In this way, he says, he will make the big fellow smaller and the little fellow bigger. He will level things out a bit.

This, no doubt, looks like a very attractive proposition. Especially is it attractive to the "little fellow", to the small owner; but it is liable to deceive even wage workers, proletarians, though not to the same extent, as we shall show subsequently.

Long's plan calls for the following measures:

1. A capital levy upon all fortunes "in excess of three or four millions of dollars". Long does not explain why the owners of four-million-dollar fortunes should escape the capital levy. Probably he has his own reasons for this.

2. This capital levy would net the United States treasury about 165 billion dollars. This sum Long promises to use as follows: (a) 100 billions to provide homes, a radio and automobile to every family in the country that does not possess it; and (b)

65 billions to provide for college education, training and maintenance for the youth of the country.

This is the first part of Long's program, his immediate plan for the leveling out of fortunes. He's also got a program for the leveling out of incomes to which we shall turn presently.

Will It Work? How Can We Get It?

We raise two questions: Will this plan work? And if it will, how can we get it realized? These are the questions to which every listener of Long must seek an answer.

Will it work? *Surely it will,* provided it is done with a view of introducing socialism in the United States and not as a utopian scheme of equalizing fortunes. If your program includes such steps as the overthrow of capitalist rule, the establishment of a workers' and farmers' Soviet government, the socialization of all large scale industry, that is, if it includes the socialist revolution *to begin with,* then the proposals for assuring to each family of toilers a home, a radio, an automobile, and all other comforts and necessities of life become a feasible and practical proposition. But if one says, as Long does, that:

> ". . . whatever the method, it will be strictly within the Constitution of the United States and it won't take as much administrative organization as we have here in Washington now." (*New York Times,* March 9, 1935.)—

he is not only day-dreaming but is also deceiving possibly himself, but surely others.

Plenty for All Is Not a Dream

Plenty for all in the United States who toil is not a dream but a practical possibility. But only under socialism, as the first phase of Communism. The Soviet Union is proving that. The wealth and technical capabilities of the toiling masses of this country open limitless possibilities in the direction of plenty for all instead of plenty for the few and misery for the many.

The "chocolate soldier" Johnson laughs at the idea of plenty for all. Why shouldn't he? He and his friends have now more than plenty and that's why the masses are starving. He says: "To abolish poverty—oh, where have I heard that before?" (*New York Times,* March 5, 1935.) The brazen cynicism of a Wall

Street flunkey is about reaching the limit. Where has he heard that before? Why, of course, from the Communist Party. But it was not quite the same tune that the "pied pipers" are now playing. The plan of the Communist Party is seriously meant and seriously fought for. That is why the Communist Party tells the American masses who seek the abolition of poverty that:

> "The necessary *first step* for the establishment of Socialism is the setting up of a revolutionary workers' government." (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

The Communist Party makes no extravagant promises as Long and Coughlin do, because the Communist Party is the revolutionary party of the workers and is responsible to the toiling masses for everything it says and does. The Communist Party points out the following:

> "The *first act* of such revolutionary workers' government would be to open up the warehouses and distribute among all the working people the enormous unused surplus stores of food and clothing.
>
> "It would open up the tremendous accumulation of unused buildings—now withheld for private profit—for the benefit of tens of millions who now wander homeless in the streets or crouch in cellars or slums.
>
> "Such a government would immediately provide an endless flow of commodities to replace the stores thus used by opening all the factories, mills and mines, and giving every person a job at constantly increasing wages." (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

This does not indulge in demagogic promises. It shows how it can be done—through a revolutionary workers' government, a Soviet government of workers and farmers. It shows in a practical way that on the morrow after the revolution, with the wealth and resources already available, every toiler in the United States could be assured *food, shelter, clothing and a job.*

But this is only a beginning, a very first step. Having expropriated at one blow the means of production of all large scale industry, commerce, transport and finance; having made it the socialist property of all toilers; having, in other words, deprived the monopolies and the capitalist class of its economic power as well as of its political power,

"Such a government would immediately begin to reorganize the present anarchic system of production along Socialist lines. It would eliminate the untold waste of capitalism; it would bring to full use the tremendous achievements of science, which have been pushed aside by the capitalist rulers from consideration of private profit. Such a Socialist reorganization of industry would almost immediately double the existing productive forces of the country." (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

And as this process of socialist reorganization proceeds upward, wealth is reproduced and increased to unheard of proportions. But this is socialist wealth, not private capitalist any more. Hence, the standard of living of all toilers rises to heights in comparison with which the schemes played with by Long and Coughlin will look puny indeed.

But It Can't Be Done Without a Socialist Revolution

Assume for the moment that Huey Long has secured as much power in the United States as he now has in Louisiana; and that, contrary to what he is doing in Louisiana, he would actually try to carry through his "share-our-wealth" plan for the country as a whole. That is, you assume that an attempt would be made—a serious attempt—to try to abolish poverty without a socialist revolution as advocated by the Communist Party.

What would happen?

Huey Long's government promulgates the capital levy. It calls upon Henry Ford, Rockefeller, and the other large fortune holders, to surrender to the U. S. treasury that part of their fortunes which is above three or four million dollars. Long has computed the value of the surplus of Ford's and Rockefeller's fortunes that would go to the United States as being about twelve billion dollars. That's a pretty hefty sum to be gotten only from two capitalists.

Meanwhile something would be happening on the Stock Exchanges. What would it be? A financial panic. Partly as a result of deliberate selling out by the big fellows in an effort to embarrass the government, partly as a result of a real fright by the smaller ones. This would at once produce a terrific depreciation of all so-called capital values: bonds, stocks, etc. The whole financial and credit structure of American capitalist econ-

omy would go to pieces, and production itself would come to a complete standstill. The twelve-billion-dollar surpluses gotten by Long from Ford and Rockefeller won't be worth the paper designating them.

Hugh Johnson, knowing his Wall Street, says that much himself.

> "If you seized all property tomorrow by taxes and sold it at an auction tax sale, nobody would have enough to bid a tenth of its value. You would cut the price of America 90 per cent and nobody but a foreigner would buy it." (*New York Times*, March 5, 1935.)

What would Huey Long's government do then? What did he do in his own state when the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana (Rockefeller) refused to pay the five-cent tax on a barrel of oil and undertook to organize civil war against Long's government? Why, Long compromised with Rockefeller and surrendered to him. This was what Long did when confronted with a determined opposition by Rockefeller to pay a tax, let alone surrender his fortune.

Suppose, however, that in the case of the whole United States, Long would not surrender but would undertake to carry through his plan of "share-the-wealth". What would he do in the face of the financial panic? What would he *have to do?* He would have to close up the Stock Exchanges and nationalize the banks and the credit structure of the country. This would already take him *beyond* his present plan, which is merely to tax the large fortunes in a constitutional way. Incidentally, we have also assumed that Long has disregarded the Supreme Court of the United States, which certainly would declare his whole scheme unconstitutional.

But his troubles did not end: they have just begun.

He has now on his hands the banks and credit structure. Who is going to manage it for him? If he should call in for this purpose the same fellows whose surplus fortunes he is proposing to confiscate, he would be putting himself and his whole scheme at their mercy. That wouldn't do. Hence he would have to build up a governmental banking and credit organization operated by people sincerely in favor of the "share-the-wealth" plan. This takes him another couple of steps beyond his present plan. It is not socialism yet, by a long shot, but it leads in the direction of

socialism—a direction in which Long says he does not want to go.

But if he means to "share-the-wealth", he will have to. And he will have to go further in the same direction.

For by having nationalized the banks he has only equipped his government with the financial powers to control industry which, after all, is the basic thing. How is he going to control industry? On what basis?

Here we must recall again that Long's present plan is outspokenly against socialism. He says he will leave the present owners in possession of their industries, and they will have to run the national economy. But at this point—already minus the banks. Will the owners of industry collaborate with Long's nationalized banking system? Hardly. They will sabotage for all they are worth. They will do what Hugh Johnson says they will:

> "Nobody works or trades or manufactures except for profit or income. If you took that away by taxes, you would stop activity, destroy employment and pauperize this country." (*New York Times*, March 5, 1935.)

And what would Huey Long do about it? Surrender or fight?

If fight, he would have to take another and *longer step* in the direction of socialism. He would have to establish workers' control of production and nationalize the means of production. He would have to put into effect another couple of planks from the program of the Communist Party which he is now mobilizing to war against.

Closing the Stock Exchanges and nationalizing the banks, inevitable steps in any sincere move to carry out the capital levy which Long speaks about, do not yet solve the problem. It only stops the financial panic and enables the government to control industry through banking, *provided* the capitalists are willing to collaborate with the government. But they won't.

The *New York Times*, an authoritative spokesman for big capital, makes that clear beyond doubt. It says:

> "Existing fortunes might be seized, but there would be no way of reproducing them when the ordinary motives for enterprise and labor and accumulation have been taken away." (Editorial, March 9, 1935.)

This paper of big capital knows what it is talking about. It says that when you take away from the capitalists the "ordinary motives for enterprise", that is, the profit motive, the untrammeled accumulation of capital for the exploitation of the masses, they will sabotage and refuse to carry on.

Another spokesman of capital, a so-called "intellectual", puts the matter even more bluntly. He says:

> "Let us suppose that the government under Huey Long's plan did own 99.8 per cent of the Ford Company and was therefore entitled to 99.8 per cent of Mr. Ford's profits. What would happen then? Would Mr. Ford and his son go on running the Ford plant and producing the profits? The senator ought to ask Mr. Ford. I suspect that Mr. Ford would say to the government: 'Well, now you own all but two-tenths of one per cent of my business. You run it and see how much profit you can make." (Walter Lippmann, *New York Herald Tribune*, March 14, 1935.)

Mr. Lippmann, the beautifier of capitalism, makes the capitalists here look too pacifist. Ford and the other exploiters of labor won't just say to the government, go ahead and run the business yourself. No, not that. They will hold on to their business and sabotage production; and they will organize war, real war, against any government that would actually go through with a capital levy that Long is playing with.

But we are running ahead of ourselves. We are still assuming that Long means what he says; and we are trying to find out what difficulties he would buck up against and how he could overcome them. To continue then.

We are at the point where the stock exchanges are closed up for good and the banks nationalized, but production at a standstill because of the sabotage of the capitalists who still own the means of production. What is the answer? The Communist Party program—not Huey Long—gives the answer: workers' control of production and immediate socialization of all large-scale industry, commerce and transportation.

> "All former claims to ownership of the means of production, including stocks, bonds, etc., would be relegated to the museum, with special provision to protect small savings. No public funds would be paid out to anyone except for services rendered to the community." (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

This and this alone would solve the problem. Will Huey Long take this step? No, of course not. That would be introducing socialism and by the only means possible—the means advocated by the Communist Party. But Long made it amply clear that he is the deadly enemy of the Communist Party. He has put forward his "share-the-wealth" plan as a means of combatting the socialist plan of the Communist Party. He said that his plan was "the only defense this country's got against Communism". (*New York Times*, March 9, 1935.)

What is the conclusion? The conclusion is: *Long does not mean what he says.* He says he stands for the abolition of poverty but attacks the *only plan*, the Communist plan, which can realize this objective.

And another conclusion: There is much similarity between Long's promises to share the wealth and Hitler's promises (before he came to power) to introduce socialism, National-Socialism. Hitler promised socialism to the German masses but attacked the Communist way—the only way—of achieving socialism. Long promises to "share-the-wealth", which is a utopian and meaningless phrase without socialism, but attacks socialism and the Communist Party which fights for it.

Why should the masses in America think that Long is better than Hitler? Why shouldn't we rather try to find out what particular circle of monopoly capital is supporting and encouraging Long to build up a fascist movement in this country? Here Walter Lippmann insinuated that some of the Republicans are secretly playing with Long, having this in view: that Long would split the Democratic Party and thus enable a Republican President to get into office at the next national election. And the "chocolate soldier", Johnson, reported even more plainly that—

> "I have a letter reciting a recent gleeful dinner of six such Senators who were happy over their own assertion: 'The next election is in the bag—all we have to do is to sit back and laugh —Huey Long and Father Coughlin are going to give it to us'." (*New York Times*, March 5, 1935.)

Who are the Senators and what are their connections with some of the more fascist-inclined monopolies? Let Johnson speak out a bit more plainly.

One thing is certain. The monopolies are already preparing

fascist breastworks against the inevitable explosion of the accumulating mass discontent and disappointment with Roosevelt and his treacherous New Deal. The monopolies see the initial growth of a mass Labor Party and of increasing Communist influence which strengthen the backbone of the workers' and farmers' resistance to the capitalist offensive. What better way, think the monopolies, is there of bolstering up the capitalist offensive upon the masses and of confusing their radicalization than the way of building up fascist movements in this country and of utilizing for this purpose such wild demagogues as Huey Long and Father Coughlin?

But let us examine the Long demagogy still from another angle.

Concentrated Wealth Is Concentrated Capital

Long and Coughlin both speak against "concentrated wealth". They say they want to see wealth de-concentrated, redistributed. But what is the bulk of concentrated wealth under the present system? It is concentrated capital, concentrated means of production used by those who control them—the capitalists—to exploit the workers and toiling masses generally.

We'll take Long's own example to illustrate the idea. He says the Ford Motor Company is worth two billion dollars. To share the wealth, he would take from Ford $1,996,000,000 for the United States Treasury, leaving Ford the remainder—four million dollars. Very well. But this sum of one billion, nine hundred and ninety-six million dollars represents the value of what? Largely of land, buildings, machinery, tools, raw materials, etc. —that is, of means of production which under capitalism is capital.

Long does not propose to break up and divide these means of production. He only proposes to divide up the shares and stocks which represent claims to these means of production. And we have already shown how such a proposal is either a reactionary scheme or it must lead to the socialist revolution. Here we are concerned with something else. We want to find out *why capital concentrates.* We want to find out how it is that, as we go along, bigger fortunes become still bigger, the small fellow is being squeezed out, and the number of propertyless is becoming larger and larger.

The question which we seek to answer is: *Will Long's "share-the-wealth" plan stop and do away with this process of concentration of wealth?*

Suppose for a moment that the capitalists of this country would accept meekly and without resistance Long's capital levy. Then after a while fortunes would become a bit leveled out. Ford would own four million dollars instead of two billion. Rockefeller would own also four million instead of ten billion, and so forth, while a large number who now own nothing or less than five thousand would each be owning five thousand dollars. Then what happens?

Production continues to be capitalist. That means, first, production for profit. Accumulation of private profits continues. Second, since the big corporations remain intact, they continue to enjoy all the advantages of capital accumulation that are offered by large-scale industry. These corporations, that according to Long's plan remain in possession of the *concentrated means of production, distribution and finance*, continue not only to exploit the wage workers but also to rob and oppress the toiling farmers and the small capitalist. The result is that *capitalist relations are reproduced again and concentration of capital is reproduced.* Big fortunes will again grow bigger, the small fellow will grow smaller and squeezed out altogether and the number of propertyless will again begin to increase. Thus after a while we will find ourselves in the same (if not worse) condition of concentrated wealth as we were when we started out with the capital levy.

What will Long do then? Another capital levy to even out fortunes once more. But we have already shown what happens to it when you try the first time. So there is no need repeating.

The argument here goes to show that concentration of wealth, of capital, is a *law of capitalist development.* And as long as capitalism prevails, this is how it develops. Especially is this true of the present stage of capitalism, the last stage, when it is fully ripe and ready to be overthrown, the stage of imperialism.

Long says he wants to do away with concentration of wealth without doing away with capitalism. This is humbug. This is fascist demagogy. As long as you have capitalist production, you inevitably have capitalist reproduction. This means the reproduction of capital and of concentrated capital; this means, on the

other hand, the reproduction of poverty and propertylessness.

An examination of Long's schemes of leveling up incomes will show his fascist humbug even more clearly.

To Regulate Earnings—Capitalist Way or Socialist Way?

After he had carried through the "share-the-wealth" plan, Long says he would begin to tackle the regulation of earnings, incomes. And in this way:

> ". . . a minimum earning would be established for any person with a family to support. It would be such a living on which one already owning a home could maintain a family in comfort of not less than around $2,500 a year to every family." (*New York Times*, March 8, 1935.)

Long has not said yet how he was going to establish such a minimum, and how he was going to enforce it. So we must try to figure it out for ourselves. And the first thing we must do is to examine Long's proposition with respect to the *various kinds* of earnings under the present capitalist system. Otherwise we get nowhere.

What kinds of earnings are there? The worker gets wages. The capitalist gets profits. These are the two main kinds of earnings in present-day capitalist society, corresponding to the two chief classes under capitalism. Then there are the kinds of earnings of the intermediary social groups and classes: toiling farmers of various sorts (farmer-owners, small tenants, share-croppers, etc.); artisans, small shopkeepers, salaried workers, etc.

Wages. Long's promise is that he would see to it that every wage-worker who has a family to support would receive a wage big enough to enable him to "maintain a family in comfort". We assume that Long would promulgate a law compelling all employers of labor to pay an appropriate wage. Today the minimum may be $2,500 a year. And, if the cost of living should continue to rise, the law would have to raise wages accordingly. Thus far the thing is reasonably clear.

But from here on several difficulties arise with Long's plan.

Suppose the capitalists, the employers of labor, either part of them or all, refuse to pay this minimum wage. This is not a far-fetched assumption. We have seen such things happen before; and we see it happening right now. Roosevelt says his government had promulgated a law compelling the employers to recognize

collective bargaining but the employers laugh at it. Could anything be done about it? Yes, a good deal. The workers, organized in fighting unions, could *strike* to enforce the minimum wage, and *with the support of the government*, the workers would surely win. No doubt about that. But Long is opposed to strikes, and he is opposed to fighting unions and to the idea of class struggle. That's why he is opposed to Communism. So we see that this way of enforcing the minimum wage, which he himself promulgated, he will not take. What other ways would be open to him?

He could promulgate another law which would tax the profits of the recalcitrant employers and out of the proceeds of this tax make good to the workers the difference between the minimum wage and that actually paid. That wouldn't be such a bad way either; for a while, at any rate. But then he would be embarking upon drastic taxation again and he would meet a similar kind of situation as the one dealt with in the case of the capital levy. That is, systematic sabotage by the capitalists which can be broken only by the socialist revolution to which Long, by his own admission, is mortally opposed. So we see that this road of enforcing the minimum wage, Long wouldn't take either. Are there any other ways open?

Yes. He could confiscate outright every plant of a recalcitrant employer, establish there real workers' control of production, and run it as a government business. But this would arouse the ire of the capitalists still more and a struggle would ensue which could be solved in the interests of the masses only by the socialist revolution. But this is taboo for Long.

So what else could he do? Surrender to the capitalists. This is what he did in Louisiana when he came in conflict with the Standard Oil on the question of taxation. When the Standard Oil raised a howl, and threatened civil war, he surrendered.* Why should we think that he will do better when in control of the federal government?

All that we said thus far on the minimum wage of $2,500 a year does not mean that only the socialist revolution can bring this about. To say so would be absolutely false. The Communist Party calls for higher wages and shorter hours, right now. It

* For an account of Long's record in office, see *The Real Huey P. Long*, by Sender Garlin, Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

incessantly works to help organize the workers to fight for such demands. That is why the Communist workers in the trade unions fight for militant policies against the capitalists. But this is not Long's plan; it is the Communist Party plan. It is a plan which calls for the building up of powerful fighting industrial unions in all industries, for the building up of an anti-capitalist mass Labor Party built on the unions, for the strengthening of the Communist Party itself as a strong mass Party, and for a united front of the masses in the daily organized struggle (strikes, mass meetings, demonstrations, etc.) to fight for higher wages, shorter hours, and other betterments of the conditions of labor. In this way, says the Communist Party, the workers can also force Congress to pass laws favorable to the workers and by their own struggles enforce the application of such laws.

Up till now we have discussed Long's plan to insure minimum earnings without considering the question of crises and unemployment. Manifestly, this question cannot be ignored.

Suppose for a moment that the employers of labor would *willingly* agree to pay their workers such a minimum wage as would enable a family to live "in comfort". Hard as it is to assume such an impossibility, seeing how the employers behave right now in such industries as steel, mining, textile, automobiles, etc., we will for a moment make such a supposition. Having done so, we ask: *and who will pay the unemployed?* There are today in the United States not less than about 12 million fully unemployed workers according to the conservative figures of the American Federation of Labor. The true figure is somewhere around 17 million. Will Long get them jobs for a wage to live in comfort with their families? And if not, will he provide for their being paid by the government the same minimum as the employed workers?

He may say: yes. He will say anything that suits his purposes. But from what we know already about his plan, we cannot take his word for it. We want to know, at least, how he proposes to do it. From his plan, as made known so far, we will show that he won't do it.

First of all, is it possible to get jobs for all the unemployed that are able to work? Surely it is. The Communist Party program points the way and shows how.

> "Such a government would immediately provide an endless flow of commodities to replace the stores thus used *by opening all factories, mills and mines, and giving every person a job at constantly increasing wages.*" (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

That is clear. After the revolutionary overthrow of the existing capitalist government, of which Huey Long is a part, and the establishment of a Workers' and Farmers' Soviet government—such a government would immediately expropriate all large-scale industry, commerce, transportation and banking. Having all this in its hands, the Soviet government would begin to run them at full capacity. It would cut down the work-day to whatever point might be necessary to insure a job and decent wages to all workers. And,

> "With the establishment of a socialist system in America, there will be such a flood of wealth available for the country as can hardly be imagined." (Manifesto of the Communist Party.)

This is the solution of the problem. The revolutionary solution. The only possible solution. But Huey Long wages war against this solution. And what is his alternative? He has none except empty promises. He says he will cut the hours of labor to thirty hours per week or less, and the work-year to eleven months or less. That is all right. That is what the Communist Party demands. But the Communist Party also says: cut in hours *without cut in weekly wages*, cut in hours *with increases in weekly wages*, because present wages are insufficient for a decent livelihood. How to get this under capitalism? By organizing and by fighting, by waging a class struggle against the capitalists—says the Communist Party program.

But even with reduced hours, without a decrease in wages, capitalist industry today could not absorb more than a fraction of the 17 million now unemployed. Furthermore, even the capitalist experts admit that only a fraction of the present army of unemployed would be absorbed into industry assuming a return of the 1929 boom. But nobody envisages such a return under capitalism. At any rate, there are no signs whatever of its approach even remotely.

Can anything be done now, before the socialist revolution, to help these millions of unemployed? Surely. It is unemployment

relief and insurance, to be paid for by the capitalists. It is the Workers' Old Age, Unemployment and Social Insurance Bill — HR. 2827—now before Congress, which was initiated and framed by the Communist Party and is supported by large masses of workers, toiling farmers and toilers generally. Will Congress adopt this bill? If Huey Long and his friends in Congress have their way, it will most probably not be adopted. But if the masses, led by the Communist Party, will wage a militant fight for it, chances are that Congress can be compelled to make this bill a law.

But what has Long on that? Nothing. Worse than nothing. He is against this program of the Communist Party; he is against the methods of class struggle advocated by the Communists. He stands with the capitalists and against the workers and toiling farmers.

We will now make one more supposition. We will suppose that the capitalists will pay willingly, without the workers fighting for it, Long's minimum wage to all—employed and unemployed. This immediately raises a very big question. *The question of national planning.* For it is evident that with the present system of anarchy in production, with each capitalist or corporation making and fighting for its own plans as against all the others, American industry couldn't reabsorb the present army of unemployed. You would have to get all the capitalists to unite harmoniously in order to decide how much each should produce, how many workers should be allocated to each plant, what should be the wages, profits, prices, quotas on the market, etc. In other words, you would have to begin the organization of *planned economy.*

Is that possible? Surely. They have established planned economy in the Soviet Union and it works fine. But there it is not the capitalists, or a capitalist government, that does the planning. *It is the workers and farmers with their own government.* This has become possible in the Soviet Union, which is the only country in the world that has a planned economy, because there was there a socialist revolution, organized and led by the Communist Party—the party of Lenin and Stalin. But this is not what Huey Long is talking about. This is what the Communist Party of the United States is talking and fighting about.

Huey Long, to begin with, promises you the realization of all

his plans *without* governmental planning and organization. Second, he promises you all these things without a socialist revolution and without the setting up of a workers' and farmers' government. This means that Huey Long is against a planned economy. Hence what must be the conclusion?

The conclusion must be that Huey Long is trying to sell to the American masses a discredited fascist humbug.

We shall prove this even more conclusively when we take up his plan for the farmers and Negroes.

Long's Promises to the Farmers and Negroes

We are continuing the discussion of that part of Long's plan which promises a minimum income of $2,500 a year to all who do not make it now. Previously we have discussed what this would mean to wages. Here we shall examine the plan as it affects the farmers and Negroes.

How would Long regulate the income of the farmers in accord with his plan?

Unlike the worker, the farmer's income is not made up of wages paid by the employer of his labor power. If you take the farmer-capitalist, his income is made up of profit (including rent, interest, etc.) derived from the exploitation of the labor he employs. With him we are not concerned here. But we are concerned with the income of the toiling farmer. Most of the farmers in this category, as a rule, employ little labor or none. They exploit their own selves and their families. They derive their incomes not by directly selling their labor power to an employer (as a wage worker) but by selling the *product* of their labor: wheat, corn, hogs, vegetables, etc.

To regulate the income of the wage (or salaried) workers under capitalism, you have got to control directly the payroll of the employer. But to regulate the income of the toiling farmer under capitalism, you have to regulate the *market.* For it is the market price of the commodities that he sells (and the means of production that he buys) that determines in the first instance the income of the toiling farmer who has produce to sell. This is not, of course, the only thing. Taxation, interest rates on the capital that the farmer must borrow, mortgage payments and

debts generally—all these have a most decisive influence upon the income of the toiling farmer.

That is why the Communist Party fights for such partial demands as abolition of taxation upon toiling farmers, cancellation of their mortgages and all other debts to the government and the bankers, etc. It fights for these partial demands as a measure of immediate alleviation of the plight of the toiling farmers. It fights in addition for immediate government relief for the farmers and for their social insurance under the Workers' Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance Bill—H.R. 2827. These measures would really alleviate, though temporarily, the sufferings of the toiling farmer. But it is the Communist Party that fights for these measures. These are not in Huey Long's plan.

Now to come back to market and prices. Can the farmer's prices be regulated in his favor so as to insure him a certain minimum income? Surely they can. Let us see how.

First, he has to be made the real owner of his produce. This means freeing the toiling farmer from all indebtedness so he can sell whenever he finds it advantageous and not when dictated to by his creditors. Also he must have government elevators and warehouses to keep his produce until sold.

Second, all speculation in agricultural products must be at once abolished and with it must go all grain exchanges. Speculation in agricultural products must be made a felony to be heavily punished.

Third, a government monopoly in all foreign trade in agricultural products must be established. The reason is clear: to protect home prices from the influence of the changes in world prices since prices of American agricultural products are determined now by the world market.

Fourth, the government must begin to accumulate reserves of imperishable agricultural goods so as to be able to release to the market (or when necessary to withdraw from it) such quantities of commodities as may be necessary either to raise or to lower prices. Such reserves the government can easily acquire by confiscating the reserves held by speculators and banks, and by buying the rest from the toiling farmers, at fixed prices.

Fifth, a wide network of farmers' cooperatives would have to be developed for joint selling and buying. These cooperatives

to be controlled by the toiling farmers and not by the government bureaucracy or the rich capitalist farmers and bankers.

After these measures have been put into effect, then we can begin to tackle in earnest the regulation of farmers' prices in favor of the toiling farmer and of the working class. But not before. These measures are the very minimum necessary to give the government—a government that can be entrusted with such a job—the power to actually fix and maintain such prices as will benefit the toiling masses.

Compare this program, which is a Communist program, with the methods of the Roosevelt A.A.A. The A.A.A. also is trying to regulate prices of agricultural products but it is trying to do it in the interests of the speculators, the banks and rich farmers. And at whose expense? At the expense of the mass of toiling farmers and of the working class and poor population of the cities. By destroying crops and limiting agricultural production generally, the A.A.A. did succeed in raising prices of agricultural commodities. But what good is it to the small farmers? They have higher prices but *less to sell* so that they are about even, if not worse off. But that is not all. The A.A.A. is part of the whole New Deal. And the other "accomplishments" of the New Deal are: an inflated dollar and proportionately larger increases in the prices of the industrial commodities which the farmer buys. Thus, while the price per quantity of goods paid to the farmer is now higher, the actual income (not the nominal) is smaller.

There are all kinds of price regulations possible. Those in the interests of the exploiters and those in the interests of the exploited. We are concerned with the latter kind whereas the A.A.A. is practicing the first kind. But the latter kind of regulation can be seriously started only after the above measures have been realized. Will Long realize these measures? Of course not. They are measures for which the Communists stand—and Long is waging war against Communism.

Thus, these five measures do not yet mean socialism. But they are steps in the direction of socialism. At any rate, no government can undertake to tackle, let alone solve, this question of good prices for the toiling farmers without first putting into effect these measures. And yet Long does not even touch the question.

He just talks of farmers' income in general; exactly like Hitler did before he came to power.

From the above it is clear that only a Soviet government, led by Communists, will put such measures into effect. Why? Because such measures constitute a serious break with the existing capitalist relations, leading to new socialist relations. It should also be clear that only fakers and fascist deceivers will promise a comfortable income, and stable income, to the toiling farmers without at least tackling price fixing *in the manner above described.*

Farmers With Nothing to Sell

We also have such farmers, large numbers of them: farmers with nothing to sell. How is Huey Long going to insure incomes and fix prices for them? Among such farmers we find farmer owners with insufficient land or implements, small tenant farmers, and share-croppers. Among the latter, large numbers of Negroes. What is their problem of securing a $2,500-a-year income?

It is the problem of more or better land, implements, seeds; and, for the tenants and share-croppers, liberation from the oppression of the landlord. Land for them, first of all. Strangely enough (or maybe it is not strange), the boss of Louisiana, which has a real share-croppers' problem, finds not a word to say about this category of farmers, although he talks a good deal about farmers. For example:

> "We would plow up no crops. . . . We would raise all the cotton we needed, and if we raised more, we would store the surplus in the government warehouses for the next year. If we got to where we had more than twelve months' supply of any crop, then we wouldn't raise any crop the next year, and that would be the year we would put on the government and state public works in that territory." (*New York Times,* March 8, 1935.)

That does not help much the share-cropper, or the landless farmer generally. Nor does it help the farmer owner who can't raise on his poor land a crop sufficient to maintain himself and his family. However, it sounds good to the farmer who owns enough and the right kind of land to make a living when all these things that Long promises will be realized. But there is a catch to it. It is, namely, that Long is opposed to all those measures

(the five measures discussed above) without which these promises are sheer deception.

Just think of it: Can you have all that we just quoted from Long while the toiling farmer is burdened with debts and at the mercy of his capitalist creditors? Can you have it while the speculators and banks dominate the markets for agricultural produce, and the fluctuations of the world market dominate American prices, and prices are not fixed and maintained by a workers' and farmers' government, and farmers' cooperatives are either insufficiently developed (as today) or controlled for the most part by agents of the rich farmers and speculators?

And think of that also: If you are to have what Long promises, you must have someone *to plan* production. Not only agricultural, but also industrial. And planned in such a way as will benefit the toiling farmers, and the working class, and the poor population of the cities. Because otherwise you will have another A.A.A. or even worse. You may get the sort of regulation that Hitler fascism established in Germany, that is, slavery in addition to hunger.

What must you have then to realize the desires of the masses for an economy of plenty with which Huey Long, in true fascist style, is brazenly playing? You must have a Workers' and Farmers' Government which you can get only by revolutionary struggle and in no other way. Only such a revolutionary government,

> ". . . would secure to the farmers the possession of their land and provide them with the necessary means for a comfortable living; it would make possible for the farming population to unite their forces in a cooperative socialist agriculture, and thus bring to the farming population all the advantages of modern civilization, and would multiply manifold the productive capacities of American agriculture." (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

Long and the Negroes

Long is playing also with the sufferings and needs of the Negroes. He quotes a letter from a Negro in Louisiana:

> "Here is a letter from a poor nigger down in our country. They are no worse off there than anywhere else. . . . I can't help him all that I would like to, but I will help every one of these white and colored people to some extent in my state." (*New York Times*, March 8, 1935.)

Note the true Southern slavedriver style: "poor nigger". But we will pass that by, for the minute. Note also the brazen and detestable lie that the Negroes in the South and in Louisiana, *"are no worse off there than anywhere else"*. Especially note the hypocritical remark that he "can't help him all that I would like to". How much would he like to? Tell us, Mr. Long, and the Negro masses in Louisiana will tell you what you *could* do.

You could abolish the share-cropping system by giving each share-cropper enough land and implements to cultivate it. The land you could get by expropriating the large estates and landholders, among them corporations, banks, etc. And the funds for implements, seeds, etc., you could get through taxation of the rich. You are talking so much about taxation.

You could abolish all taxation upon the toiling farmers, and upon the Negro farmers to begin with, and cancel all their debts to government and capitalists.

You could abolish the brutal and disgraceful system of jim-crowism and insure full and complete rights to the Negro people.

This would be good as a beginning. Then you could follow it up with the rest of the Communist program which says:

> "Such a revolutionary government . . . would proceed at once to the complete liberation of the Negro people from all oppression, secure the right of self-determination of the Black Belt, and would secure unconditional economic, political and social equality." (Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.)

Is Long the one to do it? No, not Long, nor any other fascist faker. It is the Soviet government of the United States that will do it. And to get such a government, we must fight precisely against such fakers as Long, and similar deceivers of the people. We must fight in accordance with the policies of the Communist Party.

Taxation, Credit and the Transfer of Wealth

Huey Long has made no new discoveries. He himself designates the Bible, the Pilgrim Fathers, and the philosophers of ancient Greece as the originators of his scheme for "share-the-wealth". It is admittedly an old yearning and desire of the poor and exploited from the time that society broke up into classes of

exploiters and exploited. Long merely picked up this old desire of the exploited and is playing with it for fascist purposes.

As human society was passing from one stage of development to another, this desire of the masses for sharing the wealth assumed different forms. And until capitalism arrived this desire was only a dream and was bound to remain so. Why? Because true sharing of the wealth meant Communism; and Communism, the highest form of socialism, could arise only at a certain stage in the development of the productive forces of society.

The productive forces of society, that is, the ability of society to produce wealth, had to reach such a stage where it would be possible, by abolishing exploitation, to satisfy everybody's needs. That was the first condition. The second was that division of social labor should reach such a height and the productive forces should reach a certain degree of concentration; that is, production should become social in character to such a degree as would make it possible to socialize the means of production. And the third condition was that there should arise an exploited class in society that would possess two main characteristics: (a) that its own liberation would be possible only by the abolition of all exploitation and the abolition of class divisions altogether; and (b) that it should play a decisive role in the national economy and that it should be able to take over and develop further the productive forces on a socialist basis.

These conditions for socialism, which alone lays the basis for the realization of the old dream of sharing the wealth—these conditions were created under capitalism. That's why scientific Communism—Marxism-Leninism—arose under capitalism. It couldn't arise before. But when it did arise, it transformed the old dream into a science—scientific Communism. That is what they are building with in the Soviet Union. That is what the Communist Party of America is fighting for.

Huey Long is afraid to touch the science. He prefers, instead, to play with the dream. That's what Hitler did in the interests of the German monopolies.

The Small Man's Dreams

It is among the "small men" especially, among those whom scientific Communism designates as the petty bourgeoisie, that

some new forms of the old dream find their main lodging. The working class, particularly the modern industrial proletariat, is less subject to the influences of such dreams. Being the only consistent revolutionary class because its own liberation demands the abolition of all forms of exploitation of man by man, the working class is inevitably and most easily led to the recognition that scientific Communism is its own philosophy and theory. In addition, the decisive position of the working class in the national economy and its powers of organization make it the natural leader of the struggle for the realization of the old dream along the lines of scientific Communism.

What is the main feature of these dreams of the "small man"? It is the wish to abolish extreme wealth, on the one hand, and extreme poverty, on the other, *without* abolishing class exploitation, without abolishing capitalism. That is a dream. Old Theodore Roosevelt—a Republican—played with this dream when he assured the masses that he would stop the concentration of wealth, bust the trusts, without busting capitalism from which this concentration arises. And what was the result? Today we have more concentration of wealth and more poverty. The trusts have never had more power in the country than they have today.

Franklin D. Roosevelt—a Democrat—is also playing with this dream. He announced his N.R.A., with the help of Long and others, as a means of curbing the trusts, stopping the concentration of wealth and redistributing the wealth by leveling it out. The result is well known. More millionaires and more paupers. Unheard of power by the trusts and brutal crushing of the "small man". You remember the Darrow Report.

Now Huey Long and the radio priest are making similar promises. Long says he will level out the wealth of the country by a capital levy; and the radio priest says he will accomplish the same job by restoring to Congress "its right and duty to coin and regulate the value of money". (*New York Times*, March 12, 1935.)

Measure Transitional to Socialism

Can the government's power of taxation, and its power to coin and regulate money, and the proposed power to control and regulate credit—can these powers be used to transfer the wealth

from the rich to the poor, from the exploiters to the exploited? Our answer was what?

Yes, these powers can be used for that purpose. It depends, however, on the conditions under which it is done and by what kind of a government it is done.

First about the conditions.

If it is done in the process of the socialist revolution, as first steps towards the socialization of industry, then these powers of government to tax, and to regulate currency and credit, can be used very effectively to alleviate the suffering of the masses at once and, at the same time, to accelerate the process of transferring the wealth of the nation from the capitalists to the toilers.

In other words, these powers of government can be used very effectively in the interests of the workers, toiling farmers and all exploited, only in the carrying out of measures *transitional to socialism.*

We have shown in the foregoing articles how a capital levy, such as Long is playing around with, would be (or might be) a powerful *auxiliary* instrument for hastening the transference of the wealth of the country to the exploited. We have shown how *inevitably* the carrying out earnestly of a capital levy, if it is to be made effective, would lead to certain measures of socialization, would open up the transition to socialism and the fight for the establishment of a Soviet government of workers and farmers. but *by itself,* just the promulgation of a capital levy by the government and nothing else, the capital levy would become a joke. It would never become effective. And it certainly would not achieve any significant or tangible redistribution of wealth.

What is the theoretical, the scientific explanation for that?

It is this: that the *basic* reason for concentrated wealth, and the tremendous disproportions between wealth and poverty, is the capitalist relations of *production.* It is in the sphere of production, not credit, not money, not taxation, that the basic cause lies for the existing inequalities in the distribution of wealth. *It is the capitalist ownership of the means of production.* Take this away from them and make it socialist property, and you have removed the roots of capitalism and of concentrated private wealth. To accomplish this job, or in transition to it, taxation and regulation of money and credit will be very helpful. Leave the means of production with the capitalists, and no matter what you

do by taxation, money and credit, you will not abolish concentrated wealth and poverty.

Taxation, and the regulation of money and credit, have a powerful effect upon production. The capitalist governments use such of these powers as they enjoy to protect and defend the interests of the capitalist production. And the power of regulating currency and credit, which is now in the hands of the banking oligarchy in the United States, is a powerful weapon in their hands to protect the interests of the monopolies. But why are these instruments such a powerful weapon in the hands of the banking oligarchy? Because these instruments (regulation of money and credit) are *derived from and serve a certain mode of production*, the capitalist mode of production.

What is the conclusion? If you want to use such instruments effectively for the exploited and against the capitalists, you must use them *for the purpose of building up another mode of production*, the socialist mode of production.

Now about the kind of government that can do it.

It stands to reason that if these instruments (taxation, regulation of currency and credit) can be used to accelerate the transference of wealth from the capitalists to the masses in an *effective way* only as measures transitional to the building of a socialist mode of production, *or in the actual building of it*, then the kind of government that will do it is the one that sets out to build socialism. That means a Soviet government of workers and farmers.

It is conceivable, of course, that some of these measures can be imposed upon a non-Soviet government by a powerful revolutionary upsurge of the masses. But that would mean the eve of the struggle for power which would soon sweep out that government and establish the workers and farmers in power.

That is the meaning of Marx's words:

> "That under certain economic and political conditions the credit system can serve to hasten the emancipation of the working class, just as, for instance, in the beginning of the eighteenth and again at the beginning of the nineteenth century in England it served towards transferring the wealth of one class to another, is quite unquestionable, self-evident. But to regard *interest-bearing capital as the main form of capital* while trying to use a special form of credit, the alleged abolition of interest, as the basis for a trans-

formation of society, is a thoroughly *petty-bourgeois* fantasy." (*The Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* Letter No. 72, International Publishers, New York.)

This fantasy Marx had to deal with as far back as in the 1860's to combat the ideologist of the French petty bourgeoisie, Proudhon. But it still holds good for understanding the fantastic nature of similar schemes today. And it helps to detect the fascist nature of the "ideology" of such fellows as Long and Coughlin, who play upon these fantasies of the petty bourgeoisie to build up for the monopolies fascist bulwarks against the toilers and for the capitalist offensive.

Read About the Day-to-Day Struggles of the Working Class Against Capitalism

●

READ THE

DAILY WORKER

CENTRAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U. S. A.

"America's Only Working Class Daily Newspaper"

●

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

$6.00 a year; $3.50 a half year; $2.00 for 3 months.

For Manhattan and Bronx:

$9.00 a year; $5.00 a half year; $3.00 for 3 months

SINGLE COPIES, 3 CENTS

●

DAILY WORKER

50 East 13th Street New York, N. Y.

Published by

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D, New York City

APRIL, 1935